

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 9 and 12-15 remain in the application. Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 were canceled earlier in the prosecution. Claim 1 has been amended to define the invention more clearly. New claim 15 has been added.

The Examiner objected to the claims because terms in the previously presented claims were not considered to have a clear antecedent bases in the description. Correction was required.

The specification has been amended to ensure that the terms employed in the claims also are employed in the specification with reference to the figures. Hence, the meaning of the terms in the claims can be ascertained easily by reference of the description.

The claims were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated that the claim 9 limitation that "each of said locks being completely planar to define a single plane aligned normal to the respective side walls and the base wall" was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The second sentence of the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the original specification stated that the locks are formed by making cuts in the sidewalls 12 and bending each cut portion to extend at substantially a right angle from the respective sidewalls 12. Several lines later in this same paragraph the specification proceeded to

state that the positions of both locks 17 in forward and backward directions, the projecting distances of the locks 17 from the sidewalls 12 and the bent directions of the locks 17 with respect to the sidewalls 12 have a mutually symmetrical relationship. FIGS. 1 and 2 clearly show the regions of the sidewalls 12 from which the locks 17 are cut and bent. These figures clearly show that the cuts in the sidewalls 12 and the bent locks 17 are opposed to one another and that the locks 17 are opposed and coplanar in a plane that is normal to the respective sidewalls and the base wall. The first paragraph of the detailed description further explains that the opposed sidewalls 12 project substantially perpendicularly from the base wall 11. It is submitted, therefore, that the original specification clearly teaches the skilled artisan that each of the locks is completely planar to define a single plane aligned normal to the respective sidewalls and the base wall. The Examiner will appreciate that if the locks 17 were not normal to the base wall 11, then surface regions of the respective locks 17 would be visible in the respective figures. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application did comply with the written description requirement and the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph should be withdrawn.

The previously presented claims were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Hotea (US5,334,059) considered in view of Chesnais et al. (US4,346,955) and Abe (US5,928,025). None of these references were cited earlier in the prosecution. The Examiner identified the elements of Hotea that were considered to correspond to the previously presented claims. The Examiner acknowledged that Hotea does not show locks that are perpendicular to the respective sidewalls. However, the Examiner turned to the secondary references in an effort to overcome these deficiencies of Hotea.

Hotea shows a terminal fitting where slots are formed vertically in the respective sidewalls and then approximately horizontally in portions of the sidewalls beginning at the bottom end of the vertical slot and extending in forward and backward directions at locations spaced upwardly from the base wall of the terminal fitting. The terminal fitting of Hotea then is deformed inwardly so that two converging cutting panels are formed on each sidewall. The two converging cutting angles are aligned at an angle to one other but clearly do not meet one another. As a result, these converging cutting panels function separately from one other and either can be deformed easily. Insulation of the wire can pass between the two converging cutting panels on each sidewall and displace in a way that would impede electrical connection between the terminal fitting and the conductor of the wire. In contrast to Hotea, the V-shaped insulation displacement portions of the claimed invention have front and rear planar plates that meet at a projecting end of the respective V-shape insulation displacement portion so that a single V-shape cutting edge faces up on each V-shape insulation displacement portion. It is submitted that Hotea does not teach or suggest a terminal fitting with this limitation. Additionally, the secondary references do not overcome the deficiencies of the Hotea in this regard. Accordingly, it is submitted that the invention defined by amended claim 9 and its previously presented dependent claims 12-14 is patentable over Hotea considered in view of Chesnais et al. and Abe.

New claim 15 has been added and defines the terminal fitting as further having a crimping portion disposed so that the locks are between a crimping portion and the insulation displacement portions. The crimping portion of new claim 15 is defined as being configured for crimped or folded connection with the wire. Support for this claim is

provided in the second full paragraph of page 5 of the application. The crimping portion ensures secure engagement between the wire and the terminal fitting and cooperates with the locks to resist pulling forces on the wire. The combination of the crimping portion with the insulation displacement portion achieves secure mechanical engagement with the wire and good electrical connection with the core of the wire without the labor intensive removal of insulation from the wire prior to connecting the wire to the terminal fitting. The applied art has not suggestion of this aspect of the invention.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the claims remaining in the application are directed to patentable subject matter and allowance is solicited. The Examiner is urged to contact applicant's attorney at the number below to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.

Atty. Reg. No. 30,066

Customer No. 01218

CASELLA & HESPOS LLP

274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703

New York, NY 10016

Tel. (212) 725-2450

Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: December 22, 2009